

BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP  
 RICHARD J. POCKER (NV Bar No. 3568)  
 300 South Fourth Street, Suite 800  
 Las Vegas, NV 89101  
 TELEPHONE: (702) 382-7300  
 FACSIMILE: (702) 382-2755  
 rpocker@bsflp.com

BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP  
 STEVEN C. HOLTZMAN (*pro hac vice*)  
 KIERAN P. RINGGENBERG (*pro hac vice*)  
 1999 Harrison Street, Suite 900  
 Oakland, CA 94612  
 TELEPHONE: (510) 874-1000  
 FACSIMILE: (510) 874-1460  
 sholtzman@bsflp.com  
 kringgenberg@bsflp.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
 Oracle USA, Inc., Oracle America, Inc., and  
 Oracle International Corp.

BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP  
 GEOFFREY M. HOWARD (*pro hac vice*)  
 THOMAS S. HIXSON (*pro hac vice*)  
 BREE HANN (*pro hac vice*)  
 KRISTEN A. PALUMBO (*pro hac vice*)  
 THREE EMBARCADERO CENTER  
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-4067  
 Telephone: 415.393.2000  
 Facsimile: 415.393.2286  
 geoff.howard@bingham.com  
 thomas.hixson@bingham.com  
 bree.hann@bingham.com  
 kristen.palumbo@bingham.com

DORIAN DALEY (*pro hac vice*)  
 DEBORAH K. MILLER (*pro hac vice*)  
 JAMES C. MAROULIS (*pro hac vice*)  
 ORACLE CORPORATION  
 500 Oracle Parkway  
 M/S 5op7  
 Redwood City, CA 94070  
 Telephone: 650.506.4846  
 Facsimile: 650.506.7114  
 dorian.daley@oracle.com  
 deborah.miller@oracle.com  
 jim.maroulis@oracle.com

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

ORACLE USA, INC., a Colorado corporation;  
 ORACLE AMERICA, INC., A Delaware  
 corporation; and ORACLE INTERNATIONAL  
 CORPORATION, a California corporation,

Plaintiffs,

v.

RIMINI STREET, INC., a Nevada corporation;  
 AND SETH RAVIN, an individual,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:10-cv-0106-LRH-PAL

**ORACLE'S UNOPPOSED MOTION  
 FOR A CASE MANAGEMENT  
 CONFERENCE TO DISCUSS  
 SETTING A TRIAL SCHEDULE**

Judge: Hon. Larry R. Hicks

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 16-2, Plaintiffs Oracle USA, Inc., Oracle America, Inc., and Oracle International Corp. (collectively, “Oracle” or “Plaintiffs”) submit this motion requesting that the Court schedule a Case Management Conference (“CMC”) for the purpose of discussing setting a trial schedule. This case was originally filed in January 2010 – almost four years ago. Fact and expert discovery have long since closed, and summary judgment motions have been pending for more than a year. Setting a trial schedule will allow this case to be brought to resolution. Accordingly, Oracle requests that the Court schedule a CMC at which the parties can discuss with the Court the setting of a trial schedule.

Prior to filing this motion, Oracle met and conferred with Defendants Rimini Street, Inc. and Seth Ravin (collectively, “Rimini” or “Defendants”). Defendants stated they are not opposed to the setting of a CMC if the Court is of the opinion that such a conference would be productive.

#### **I. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

Oracle filed this action on January 25, 2010. Dkt 1 (Complaint). Fact discovery closed on December 5, 2011. Dkt 161 at 9 (modified scheduling order). Expert discovery closed on May 18, 2012. Dkt 232 at 3 (modified scheduling order). Oracle filed two motions for partial summary judgment. The first was filed on March 30, 2012 (Dkt 237 (Motion)), and briefing was completed on May 15, 2012 (Dkt 284 (Reply)). Oracle filed its second motion for partial summary judgment on September 14, 2012 (Dkt 405 (Motion)), and briefing was completed on October 26, 2012 (Dkt 454 (Reply)). There are no other pending motions, and currently there is no trial date set.

#### **II. ORACLE REQUESTS A CMC**

Civil Local Rule 16-2 states that “[a] party may at any time make written request for a pretrial conference to expedite disposition of any case, particularly one which is complex or in which there has been delay.” This case is complex, and there has been delay, which is prejudicial to the parties. Oracle alleges copyright infringement and related claims against Rimini, and Rimini denies wrongdoing and alleges a counterclaim for defamation. While this case remains unresolved, neither side is vindicated, and both are required to deal with business

1 uncertainty. Scheduling a date for a jury trial, and then related dates for pretrial deadlines (such  
2 as Daubert motions and motions in limine) will allow the parties to plan and will enable the  
3 Court to bring this case to its finish. Given the complexities of this case, Oracle believes that a  
4 discussion with the Court at a CMC concerning pretrial deadlines and a trial schedule would be  
5 an efficient and useful way to address trial scheduling issues. Accordingly, Oracle requests that  
6 the Court schedule a CMC at a date and time convenient for the Court.

7  
8 DATED: January 10, 2014

BINGHAM McCUTCHEN LLP

9  
10 By: /S/ Geoffrey M. Howard

11 Geoffrey M. Howard (*pro hac vice*)  
12 Three Embarcadero Center  
13 San Francisco, CA 94111-4067  
14 Telephone: 415.393.2000  
15 Facsimile: 415.393.2286  
16 geoff.howard@bingham.com

17 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on January 10, 2014, I served via CM/ECF a true and correct copy of the foregoing document to all parties and counsel as identified on the CM/ECF-generated Notice of Electronic Filing.

DATED: January 10, 2014

BINGHAM McCUTCHEN LLP

By: /s/ Geoffrey M. Howard

Geoffrey M. Howard  
Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
Oracle USA, Inc., Oracle America, Inc.,  
and Oracle International Corp.